Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

# Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 GENEVA 07545 191921Z

50/44
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 IO-10 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-03 H-01 INR-05

L-02 NSAE-00 NSC-05 PA-01 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15

USIA-06 ACDA-05 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 CU-02 OIC-02 AEC-05

SAM-01 NIC-01 /082 W
---------- 116129
R 181540Z DEC 74
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 9728
INFO ALL CSCE CAPIALS 227
AMEMBASSY OSLO
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
USLO SACLANT NORFOLK VA
USDOCOSOUTH
CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L GENEVA 7545

C O R R E C T E D C O P Y (MRN SHOULD READ 7545 VICE 74)

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: PFOR, PARM, CSCE
SUBJECT: CSCE: CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES;TURKISH AREA PROBLEM

REF: STATE 273267

1. FOLLOWING ARE US DEL'S ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS POSED IN REFTEL CONCERNING TURKISH AND ALLIED THINKING ON AREA PROBLEM.

2. (Q.) ARE TURKS TAKING A POSITION THAT TURKEY LIES ENTIRELY IN EUROPE? (A.) IN DISCUSSIONS OF THIS ISSUE AT NATO CAUCUSES, TURKS HAVE DRAWN DISTINCTION BETWEEN GEOGRAPHIC AND POLITICAL CRITERIA. THEY HAVE TAKEN POSIION THAT ALTHOUGH ANATOLIA IS OUTSIDE EUROPE GEOGRAPHICALLY, ALL OF TURKEY SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN EUROPE IN POLITICAL TERMS AND PARTICULARLY IN RESPECT TO CSCE.
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 GENEVA 07545 191921Z

THUS, THEYHAVE FAVORED A UK FORMULA WHICH SPECIFICALLY DESCRIBES

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

TURKEY AS LYING IN EUROPE (GENEVA 7260) AND HAVE OPPOSED FORMULA-
TIONS TERMING TURKEY A STATE WHOSE TERRITORY "EXTENDS BEYOND
EUROPE." THIS POSITION, HOWEVER, HAS MADE IT DIFFICULT FOR TURKISH
DELEGATION TO FIND APPROPRIATE RATIONALE FOR DEFENDING THE TURKISH
GENERAL STAFF'S INSISTENCE ON EXEMPTING CENTRAL ANATOLIA.
ORIGINALLY, TURKS TOOK POSITION AT CAUCUS THATTURKEY SHOULD NOT BE
EXPECTED TOINCLUDE ALL OF ITS "TERRITORY IN ASIA" SINCE SOVIETS
WOULD NOT EVEN BE INCLUDING ALL OF THEIR TERRITORY IN EUROPE
(GENEVA 6290). ON DEC 13, HOWEVER, TURKISH REP TOLD US HAT HIS
DEL WOULD NOT USE THIS RATIONALE AT SUB-COMMITTEE AND HE ADMITTED
THAT THEY WERE SEARCHING, WITH DIFFICULTY, FOR SOME OTHER LINE OF
ARGUMENT. TURKISH REP COMPLAINED THAT TURKISH DEL WAS "CAUGHT
IN THE MIDDLE" BETWEEN THEIR GENERAL STAFF AND OTHER CSCE PARTICI-
PANTS.

3. (Q.) HOW STRONG IS TURKISH DESIRE TO COVER SOVIET BLACK
SEA AND CAUCASUS AREAS, IN ADDITION TO SOVIET WESTERN BOUNDARY AREA?
(A.) TURKS WOULDLIKE TO COVER SOVIET BLACK SEAS AND CAUCASUS AREAS
BUT PROBABLY WOULD NOT INSIST UPON IT IN FACE OF VIGOROUS SOVIET
OPPOSITION (SEE ALSO PARAS 4 AND 5 BELOW).

4. (Q.) ARE THETURKS WILLING TO ACCEPT A FULLY RECIPROCAL APPLI-
CATION TO THE USSR ANDTURKEY IN THE BLACK SEA AND CAUCASUS AREAS?
(A.) TURKS HAVE SAID THAT APPLICATION TOTURKEY WOULD HAVE TO BE
"PROPORTIONAL" (GENEVA 6290), NOT FULLY RECIPROCAL, SINCETURKISH
TERRITORY IS SO MUCH SMALLER THAN THAT OF USSR, AND BECAUSE THEY
WANT TO INSURE EXEMPTION OF CENTRAL ANATOLIA. THEY HAVE NOT
SPECIFIED WHAT THE PROPORTION SHOULD BE, HOWEVER.

5. (Q.) WOULD TURKS BE AMENABLE TO NO OR SHARPLY LIMITED APPLI-
CATION OF CBMS ALONG SOUTHERN BORDERS OF USSR IF CORRESPONDING
PORTIONS OF TURKEY ARE LIKEWISE EXCLUDED? (A.) TURKS HAVE INFORMED
CAUCUS (GENEVA 6290) THATTHEY WOULD BE PREPARED NOTIFY MANEUVERS IN
PROPORTIONALZONE ALONG BLACK SEA, AEGEAN AND (WITH SOME EXCEPTIONS)
MEDITERRANEAN COASTS ONLY IF SOVIETS AGREED TO GIVE NOTIFICATION IN
ZONE ALONG ITS BLACK SEA COAST. THUS, IF SOVIETS EXEMPTED SOUTHERN
BORDERS FROM NOTIFICATION, TURKS WOULD PROBABLY WANT TO EXEMPT
ALL OF ANATOLIA AS THE "CORRESPONDING PORTION".

6. (Q.) HOW STRONGLY DO OTHER ALLIES FEELTHAT SOVIET BLACK SEA
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 GENEVA 07545 191921Z

AND CAUCASUS AREAS BE COVERED? WOULD THEY BE WILLING TO EXCLUDE
ALL AREAS OF THE USSR OTHER THAN WESTERN BOUNDARY AREA?
(A.) OTHER ALLIED REPS ON SUB-COMMITTEE HAVE INDICATED STRONG
INTEREST IN COVERING USSR AREAALONG BALTIC AS WELLAS WESTERN
(LAND) BOUNDARY AREA. OUR IMPRESSION IS THA THEY ARE CONSIDERABLY
LESS INTERESTED IN COVERAGEOF ENTIRE SOVIET BLACK SEAS AREA AND
CAUCASUS. SHOULD BE NOTED, HOWEVER, THAT ALL ALLIES FAVOR COVER-
AGE OF WESTERN REACHES OF SOVIET TERRITORY IN ZONE OF SUBSTANTIAL

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

DEPTH AND THAT SUCH A ZONE WOULD INCLUDE PORTIONS OF BLACK SEA COASTS OF MOLDAVIAN AND UKRAINIAN REPUBLICS.

7. (Q.) HOW STRONG IS THE TURKISH DESIRE TO EXCLUDE THEIR NON-EUROPEAN FRONTIERS (I.E. WITH IRAN, IRAQ, AND SYRIA)? IF THE TURKS COULD OBTAIN THIS EXCEPTION, WOULD THEY BE WILLING TO ABANDON THEIR DESIRE TO COVER SOVIE BLACK SEA AND CAUCASUS AREAS? WHAT ARE TURKISH PREFERENCES AS BETWEEN THESE OBJECTIVES? (A.) WE BELIEVE TURKS ARE DETERMINED TO EXCLUDE THEIR NON-EUROPEAN FRONTIER AREAS FROM NOTIFICATION AND THAT THIS IS MORE IMPORTANT TO THEM THAN SECURING COVERAGE OF SOVIET BLACK SEA AND CAUCASUS AREAS. HOWEVER, IF THEY COULD NOT OBTAIN COVERAGE OF THESE SOVIET AREAS, TURKS HAVE SAID THEY WOULD WANT TO EXCLUDE VIRTUALLY ALL OF ANATOLIA, AS NOTED ABOVE, NOT JUST THEIR NON-EUROPEAN FRONTIERS.

8. (Q.) HOW STRONGLY ARE OTHER ALLIES WILLING TO FIGHT FOR TURKISH EXCEPTIONS? WHAT ARE ALLIED ATTITUDES OWARD THE TURKISH DESIRE O EXCLUDE NON-EUROPEAN TRKISH FRONTIERS? (A.) GREEK DEL IN-FORMED SUB-COMMITTEE SEVERAL MONTHS AGO THAT IT WAS OPPOSED TO ANY TERRITORIAL EXCEPTIONS FOR PARTICIPATING STATES (EXCEPT OF COURSE US AND CANADA). GREEKS HAV NOT COMMENTED FURTHER ON THIS ISSUE OR ON SPECIFIC URKISH QUESTIONS EITHER AT SUB-COMMITTEE OR A CAUCUSES BUT THEY WILL ALMOST CERTAINLY SUPPORT PREDICTABLE CYPRIOT OBJECTIONS TO EXEMPTIONS FOR MERSIN-ISKENDERUN AREA OF TURKEY AND MAY INSIST ON EXEMPTIONS FOR GREECE IF TURKS SEEK TO EXCLUDE AEGEAN AND REST OF MEDITERRANEAN COASTS AS WELL. OTHER ALLIES ON SUB-COMMITTEE SEEM SYMPATHETIC TO TURKISH DESIRE EXCLUDE THEIR NON-EUROPEAN FRONTIERS AND WOULD PROBABLY SUPPORT TURKS ON THIS POINT AT SUB-COMMITTEE. THERE HAVE, HOWEVR, BEEN NO SIGNS OF SUPPOR FROM ANY OF THE ALLIES FOR THE ADDITIONAL EXEMPTIONS TURKS WANT OPPOSITE CYPRUS AND IN CENTRAL ANATOLIA OR FOR THOSE THEY MAY WANT ALONG AEGEAN AND THE RES OF HEIR MEDITERRANEAN COAST. OTHER ALLIES HAVE TAKEN POSITION THAT THEY ARE WITHOUT INSTRUCTIONS
CONFIDENTIAL



ON THESE ISSUES AND HAVE STUGHT TO KEEP DETAILS OF TURKISH PROBLEM FROM SURFACING AT SUB-COMMITTEE. PRIVATELY, HOWEVER, BRITISH, FRENCH, AND FRG HAVE INDICATED STRONG CONCERN ABOU THESE ADDIIONAL TURKISH EXEMPTIONS AND WE THINK IT UNLIKELY THAT TURKS WILL BE ABLE TO DEVELOP ANY SUBSTANTIAL SUPPOR FROM ALLIES RE-GARDING THESE AREAS.

9. (Q.) HOW WOULD TURKS RECONCILE DESIRE TO EXCLUDE AREA FACING CYPRUS WITH THEIR INTEREST IN DOWNPLAYING CYPRUS ISSUE IN GENERAL AT CSCE? (A.) AT CAUCUSES, TURKS HAVE ARGUED, LAMELY, THAT EXCLUSION OF MERSIN-ISKENDERUN AREA HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH CYPRUS AND THAT THE EXCLUSION IS SOUGHT BECAUSE THESE PORTS RECEIVE SUPPLIES FOR THEIR TROOPS IN NORTHEAS TURKEY OPPOSITE SOVIET FRONTIER. PRIVATELY,TURKISH REP ON SUB-COMMITTEE HAS ACK-NOWLEDGED THAT SURFACING OF THESE TURKISH DEMANS WOULD ENRAGE

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

CYPRIOTS AND EMBROIL SUB-COMMITTEE IN CYRPUS ISSUE. HE HAS CITED THIS AS ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF THE DIFFICULT POSITION IN WHICH HIS DELEGAION HAS BEEN PLACED BY ITS INSRUCTIONS FROM TURKISH GENERAL STAFF. IN EFFORT TO AT LEAST DEFER SUCH AN IMBROGLIO, TURKISH REP HAS BEEN COOPERATING WITH OTHER ALLIES IN AVOIDING DISCUSSION OF DETAILS OF TURKISH PROBLEM AT SUB-COMMITTEE. TURKISH DEL IS OBVIOUSLY RELUCTANT TO PRESS ITS FULL DEMANDS AT SUB-COMMITTEE WITHOUT BEING ABLE COUNT ON SUBSTANTIAL ALLIED SUPPOR. IF, DESPITE TURKISH EFFORTS HERE AND IN BRUSSELS, THIS SUPPORT IS NOT FORTHCOMING, WE THINK TURKISH DEL WOULD SEEK SOME MODIFICATION OF ITS INSTRUCTIONS. AS TURKS HERE HAVE ALREADY INDICATED (GENEVA 6451), THEIR AUTHORITIES MIGHT BE MORE AMENABLE TO MODERATING THEIR DEMANDS IF IT ALSO BECAME APPARENT THAT SUB-COMMITTEE'S NEGOTIATIONS ON OTHER PARAMETERS AND ON NAURE OF COMMITMEN WERE LEADING TO A SUBSTANTIAL WATERING-DOWN OF HE MANEUVER CBM. DALE

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

# Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994
**Channel Indicators:** n/a
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED
**Concepts:** COLLECTIVE SECURITY, CBMS, MILITARY PLANS, MILITARY EXERCISES
**Control Number:** n/a
**Copy:** SINGLE
**Draft Date:** 18 DEC 1974
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960
**Decaption Note:**
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED
**Disposition Approved on Date:**
**Disposition Authority:** ElyME
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004
**Disposition Event:**
**Disposition History:** n/a
**Disposition Reason:**
**Disposition Remarks:**
**Document Number:** 1974GENEVA07545
**Document Source:** CORE
**Document Unique ID:** 00
**Drafter:** n/a
**Enclosure:** n/a
**Executive Order:** GS
**Errors:** N/A
**Film Number:** D740369-0956
**From:** GENEVA
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a
**Image Path:**
**ISecure:** 1
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19741226/aaaaawib.tel
**Line Count:** 185
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
**Office:** ACTION EUR
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a
**Page Count:** 4
**Previous Channel Indicators:**
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a
**Reference:** 74 STATE 273267
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED
**Review Authority:** ElyME
**Review Comment:** n/a
**Review Content Flags:**
**Review Date:** 09 APR 2002
**Review Event:**
**Review Exemptions:** n/a
**Review History:** RELEASED <09 APR 2002 by boyleja>; APPROVED <26 MAR 2003 by ElyME>
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**
**Review Referrals:** n/a
**Review Release Date:** n/a
**Review Release Event:** n/a
**Review Transfer Date:**
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a
**Secure:** OPEN
**Status:** NATIVE
**Subject:** CSCE: CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES;TURKISH AREA PROBLEM
**TAGS:** PFOR, PARM, CSCE
**To:** STATE
**Type:** TE
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005